

Motion DENIED.

This the 7th day of February, 2019.

/s/Louise W. Flanagan, U.S. District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

413 MIDDLE STREET

NEW BERN, NC 28560

FILED

DEC 27 2018

PETER A. MOORE, JR., CLERK
US DISTRICT COURT, EDNC
BY [Signature] DEP CLK

USA

V.

TARIQ BELT

NO.: 5:18-CR-66-FL-1

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND REVERSAL OF THE DENIAL DECISION AND, ALTERNATIVELY, FOR A RULING ON THE ISSUE OF ELIMINATING OR REDUCING DRUG TESTING AND OTHER SUPERVISION CONDITIONS AND DEFERRAL OF DECISION UNTIL AFTER JANUARY 14, 2018 OR RULING ON DISMISSAL MOTION AS TO ANY STATEMENT OF CHARGES APPLICATION FILED IN AA COUNTY, MARYLAND COURTS

To the Honorable, the U.S. District Court:

INTRODUCTION

Comes now in Good Faith, Pro Se, Tariq Belt with this motion for reconsideration and, alternatively, for a ruling on the issue of 'ELIMINATING OR REDUCING DRUG TESTING AND OTHER SUPERVISION CONDITIONS AND DEFERRAL OF DECISION UNTIL AFTER JANUARY 14, 2018 OR RULING ON DISMISSAL MOTION AS TO ANY STATEMENT OF CHARGES APPLICATION FILED IN AA COUNTY, MARYLAND COURTS.'

This follow-up and supplement is done out of an abundance of caution and for the sake of the accuracy of the record in this matter. This document is intended to be considered inclusive of, and as a supplement to, the Belts submitted but not considered timely and comprehensive Reply to the Opposition of the Government which this court perhaps had no chance to – or did not - consider before releasing its decision. The same is annexed and incorporated fully herein by reference as if set forth more fully herein at length. This courts indulgence is asked. Where facts are unresolved, upon which another office or agency has made or withheld recommendations, but the circumstances will soon change or error of facts will soon reveal itself and is being addressed by the adversely impacted party, the deferral of a ruling which is adverse and may otherwise later come to be based in faulty records is proper.

What Belt asks herein will conserve judicial resources and is not prejudicial to any party involved. Moreover, the court cannot be considered – strictly speaking – to have weighed 18 USC 3553 factors properly where facts, recommendations, or withheld recommendations, were or are likely based in determinations which are adverse and based in improper records or based in decisions subject to change or challenge and which were adverse and based in improper records. This court must consider